

The Federal Magistrate Act provides that “a district court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specific proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir.1983). “By contrast, in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not

conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Similarly, de novo review is not required by the statute “when a party makes general or conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Moreover, the statute does not on its face require any review at all of issues that are not the subject of an objection. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *Camby*, 718 F.2d at 200. Nonetheless, a district judge is responsible for the final determination and outcome of the case, and the Court has accordingly reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s M&R.

### **III. DISCUSSION**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c), a party is given fourteen (14) days to file specific written objections to a Magistrate Judge’s proposed findings and recommendations. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c); see also, Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). The parties were notified that objections to the M&R must be filed within this time frame, but Alqolaq did not file any objections as of the date of this Order. Considering no objections were filed, and after a review of the record in this case, the Court finds that the Magistrate Judge’s findings that there are insufficient allegations to support Plaintiff’s Count Two claims of bad faith, or in the alternative, unfair and deceptive trade practices, are consistent with and supported by law.

### **IV. CONCLUSION**

**IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED** that:

1. The M&R (Doc. No. 12) is hereby **ACCEPTED**.
2. Plaintiff State Farm Fire and Casualty Company’s Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 7)

is **GRANTED** and Count Two of Plaintiff's Complaint is **DISMISSED**.

Signed: May 12, 2011

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Robert J. Conrad, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

Robert J. Conrad, Jr.  
Chief United States District Judge

